DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 222 HE 013 486

AUTHOR Harrison, Patrick R.: Leadbetter, Beth
TITLE Comparisons of Men and Women at the U.S. Naval Academy: Outcomes and Processes in Their Development.
INSTITUTION Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 42p.: Prepared through the Division of Professional Development.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Education: Academic Standards: Administrative Policy: *Armed Forces: Athletics: *Coeducation: College Admission: College Environment: Comparative Analysis: Educational Policy: *Equal Education: Extracurricular Activities: Females: Higher Education: Interpersonal Relationship: Males: *Military Schools: Military Training: Physical Fitness: School Holding Power: *Sex Differences: *Sex Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS *Naval Academy MD

ABSTRACT

The integration of women into the U.S. Naval Academy is analyzed. Areas of concern identified before the arrival of women in the class of 1980 were fraternization, acceptance, physical conditioning, berthing, leading and counseling females, publicity, athletic outlets, extra-curricular involvement, summer cruises, weight and diet requirements, and roommates. These areas are looked at with reference to other controlling issues: policy, admissions, attrition, academic and military performance, physical standards performance, conduct and authority, leadership performance, dating, and general living conditions. It was found that women have successfully adapted to the rigors of Academy life and have shown equivalent performance on a majority of outcome measures. In the initial class, which entered in 1976, attrition was high, but the rate has declined. Subsequent classes have experienced more integration and less assimilation, with more reciprocal change. Policy continues as a basis of inequity, and must change for women to be taken seriously in the Academy, and low female enrollment ensures inadequate representation in the authority structure. Statistical tables are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201222

CE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patrick Harrison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMPARISONS OF MEN AND WOMEN AT THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY: OUTCOMES AND PROCESSES IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT

Patrick R. Harrison
and
Beth Leadbetter

Division of Professional Development
U. S. Naval Academy

CE013426

Do not quote without permission of the authors. Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect views or endorsements of the Navy.

Abstract

This report summarizes the results of the integration of women at the U. S. Naval Academy after the first four years. Naturally occurring probes that represent traditional unobstrusive measures provided the basis for the description of the outcomes and processes. Areas of discussion include: policy, admissions and attrition, academic and military performance, physical standards, conduct and authority, leadership performance, dating, fraternization, and general living conditions in Bancroft Hall.

FEB 2 1981

Comparisons of Men and Women at the U. S. Naval Academy: Outcomes and Processes in their Development

The traditions, values, customs, and programs of the U. S. Naval Academy represent over one hundred years of evolution around the goal of training combat ready Naval and Marine Corps officers. In 1976, eighty-one women entered this institution, precipitating a major change to this evolutionary track. The mandate, public law 94-106, of 7 October 1975 stated:

> ". . . the academic and other relevant standards required for appointment, admission, training, graduation, and commissioning of female individuals, shall be the same as those required for male individuals, except for those minimum essential adjustments in such standards required because of physiological differences between male and female individuals."

This mandate has produced an interactive process of change to both the policy and the operating characteristics of the Academy. Women have adapted to the rigors of Academy life and have shown equivalent performance on a majority of outcome measures used to monitor progress relative to Academy standards. At the same time, there are clear differences in the setting operations tied to these outcomes and processes being measured.

This report summarizes the results of using various institutional probes and measurements to look at equivalence in the programmed outcomes for the men and women midshipmen. The focus was on naturally occurring probes that represented unobstrusive measures. The results of more intrusive studies which employed artifical probes will be noted, but shall be regarded with a fair degree of conservatism. Both men and women reacted strongly to direct probes; all such impositions were assumed highly reactive. This response was part of their informal culture with its own traditions, values, and language sets, that were passed from generation to generation and allowed a medium for their expression of their own priorities within the constraining bounds of the formal organization. From the midshipmen's point of view, they are continually being evaluated. Evaluation is taken seriously because it has consequences to their professional standing. As a result, they regard any new measurement with suspicion.

The women in the pioneer Class of 1980, have shown an atypical profile on most of the studies administered relative to women in other classes. At each step in the program, the Class of 80 women initialized the system. Their data, therefore, was difficult to use comparatively, although more stable trends were apparent in the classes of 81, 82, and 83. All results, because of this, were considered tentative--having been taken during a period of organizational instability relative to the new program. The plebe class of 1983 was the first class to see women at all levels of leadership in the Brigade of Midshipmen. As this class moves toward their senior year, the history of the Naval Academy as an "all male institution", will be replaced by the new reality of an integrated Brigade of Midshipmen. At that time, more stable trends should be seen in studies of the integration program.

In preparation for the arrival of the women in the Class of 1980, several areas of concern surfaced which would be particularly disruptive to the "integration" progress. These included: fraternization, acceptance, physical conditioning, berthing, leading/counseling females, publicity, athletic outlets, extra-curricular involvement, summer cruises, weight/diet requirements, and roommates. These problems were complex and interactive within and across different organizational levels at the Academy. They will be addressed relative to the complex controlling issues, which included: policy, admissions and attrition, academic and military performance, physical standards performance, conduct and authority, leadership performance, dating and fraternization, and general living conditions in Bancroft Hall.

Policy

The mission of the U. S. Naval Academy is "To prepare midshipmen morally, mentally, and physically to be professional officers in the naval service." This statement has reflected the overall goal of the Naval Academy since it opened its doors in 1845. U. S. Code 6015 stipulates that any duty available to the men in the Navy or Marine Corps, shall also be available to women. The only exception to this statute, is the situation where a woman's duty would place her in a combat situation. This proved to be an important setting operation beyond our control. This variance in the policies affecting the men and women provided a ready, built-in rationalization for those who believed that women did not belong at the Naval Academy. The difference in the combat situation policy for the men and women affected the perception of the midshipmen, and the staff, concerning the objectives of the program vis-a-vis the women. Certain training opportunities for the women at USNA had to be changed to remain within the bounds of U. S. Code 6015. Table 1 summarizes the effect this Code had on the military training. During their second class summer, the women were not permitted to participate in the night operations in the Surface Warfare training phase, nor were they permitted to participate in the underway training aboard the submarines. Also, because of a lack of adequate facilities for women in San Diego, and the Great Lakes, they were only able to become involved in the leadership training program in Orlando, during their first class year. Further, the well known statement that nothing would be changed at the Naval Academy, except the "plumbing" was misleading to a number of individuals with regard to the complexity of the integration process. When the women at the Academy learned that "measuring up"

meant conforming to male standards the process of integration became a more difficult one, of assimilation, rather than integration. The expectation implicit in this exo-system level (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) policy translated in the minds of the midshipmen, to the micro-system level as "if a woman cannot run the mile as fast as a man, then the women as a group are failing, and are not measuring up." Or rather, if the Academy changed its standards to accomodate the women, the entire program at USNA was deteriorating. U. S. Code 6015, therefore, acted as a setting operation, that amplified negative attitudes and biased the intepretation of change.

Insert Table 1 about here

Admissions and Attrition

Table 2 shows the admission figures for the total number of students in the classes of 80, 81, 82, and 83, and for the women in each class.

Insert Table 2 about here

The total number of male applicants has decreased each year for the past four years, while the number of female applicants has increased each year through the Class of 1983.

Insert Table 3 about here

Women represent approximately six percent of the Brigade of Midshipmen (about the same percentage as women officers in the Navy). The women had a higher attrition rate than their male classmates in all classes. They had, however, a lower attrition rate than their female counterparts at the Air Force Academy, or at West Point. The trend for the classes of 80 through 83 at USNA appeared to be essentially stable, with an approximate eight percent greater attrition for the women than the men. A comparison of the percentage and the time of attrition for the men and women is listed in Table 4. The highest attrition of the women in the classes of 80, 82, and 83, was in Plebe Year, while the highest attrition of women in the Class of 81, was in Youngster Year (sophmore or third class year).

Insert Table 4 about here

Women showed significantly more attrition during Plebe Summer, than the men, (although the attrition rate was less for the Naval Academy women in the Class of 80, after pre-training, than it was for the women at West Point or the Air Force Academy.) The women at the Naval Academy also had a much higher attrition rate than their male classmates during their Youngster Year (third and fourth semesters) with the exception of the Class of 1980's women, who lost their largest number during Plebe Year.

Table 5 lists the reasons why men and women attrite from the Naval Academy.

Insert Table 5 about here

While roughly an equal number of men and women left for voluntary reasons during Plebe Summer, approximately fifteen percent more women, than men, attrited for voluntary reasons during the Academic year. Fifteen percent more men than women (excluding the Class of 1983 whose trend was nearly equal for Plebe Year only) left the Academy for Academic reasons. And more men than women, again with the exception of the Class of 1980, were disqualified for Medical reasons.

Table 6 shows the SAT scores for the men and women still on board, and for those who have attrited. The women were higher in SAT verbal scores, than the men in each class, but lower in the SAT math scores.

Insert Table 6 about here

The men who attrited from USNA had consistently lower SAT scores than the men who remained on board. The women's trend was inconclusive, however, and fluctuated for each class. Table 7 shows other comparative measures used in the selection process at the Naval Academy.

Insert Table 7 about here

The trend for men in high school class rank, recommendations, extra-curricular activities, the Strong Campbell Engineering Science scale, and the Strong Campbell Disenrollment scale, followed that of their SAT scores. The men who remained at USNA scored higher on these variables than the men who attrited. The women's trend was, again, inconsistent, and followed a see-saw pattern, except for the measurements taken on the strong Campbell Engineering Science Scale. In the area of Engineering, the women who separated from the Naval Academy scored lower on the Engineering Scale than the women who remained.

Academic and Military Performance

Table 8 shows cummulative grade point averages, at the end of each Academic school year, for the men and women in all classes. This table summarizes both academic and military performance--the two major measurements of progress within the system.

Insert Table 8 about here

The trends for the men and women were parallel across semesters and were essentially equivalent. The variance for the two groups was essentially the same. It appears that these two important measures of success within the system have equivalent outcomes. Table 9, however, shows that the distribution of majors was quite different for the men and women. A significantly greater percentage of women selected a major in the area of humanities, social science, and science, (i.e. chemistry, mathematics, oceanography, physical science, physics, and applied science) while the men chose majors in the fields of engineering and science. In all of the majors at the Academy, a considerable number of mathematic and engineering courses were required, so that all majors had a substantial background in these important areas. Analysis of QPR's within each major for the men and women showed no significant differences.

Insert Table 9 about here

Physical Standards Performance

As part of the measured physical standards performance each semester, the midshipmen were required to complete an applied strength test, a timed mile run test, and the obstacle course. Both the standards, and the content of the applied strength tests were different for the men and women. Women were required to do flexed arm hangs rather than chin-ups, and had to do fewer sit-ups, and jump a shorter distance in the standing long jump, than their male classmates. The minimum passing time for the men was 6:30, and for the women, it was 7:30, on the mile run. And the maximum completion time was 2 minutes 55 seconds for the men, and 3 minutes 40 seconds for the women on the obstacle course. The changes made for the women on the obstacle course consisted of a shortened wall, an added box to lessen the distance over a tall obstacle, and a shortened set of monkey bars.

Insert Table 10 about here

Table 11 shows that in spite of the different standards for the men and women on the Physical performance tests, the women had more failures than the men. The women had particular problems with the mile run; especially evident in the D and F categories. On the other hand, the women were highly successful on the applied strength test, and the obstacle course. Clinical interventions suggested, however, that a large number of the women failed for psychological rather than physical reasons.

Insert Table 11 about here

Conduct and Authority

Table 12 shows the demerits awarded in the first and second semester of Academic Year 1979-80. Women were, clearly, involved in fewer major offenses than the men, and tended to get "fried" (demerits) less often. The average woman at USNA, received approximately 5½% fewer demerits than the average midshipman; and 7% more "A's" in Conduct grades, than the average male.

Table 13 shows the distribution of women midshipmen in the different positions of authority on the Brigade, Regimental, Battalion, and Company levels.

Insert Table 13 about here

The total number of women available for the positions was an important factor here, but even in view of this, there existed significant inequities in the distribution of authority within the Brigade. Except for two LCDR positions on the Battalion level during the first semester, the men dominated the highest three ranking positions of CAPT, CDR, and LCDR, for the Class of 1980. The highest concentration of women was in the Ensign billets on the company level, where they performed the most routine duties assigned as squad leaders.

Table 14 shows the comparison of men and women in positions of authority, and the total number and percentage of positions available for the men and the women in the class. In every striper billet available, the men filled the positions from 90 to 100 percent of the time, except for the Ensign billets. The men dominated the highest ranks, as well as the MPO rank, which required them to give commands to their companies at all outdoor formations. The percentage of men holding any striper position at all, however, was surprisingly lower than that of the women. During the first semester, only 36.7% of the men were in leadership positions, as opposed to 94.5% of the women. At this time, however,

only 75.7% of these men were LTjg's and below, while 94.2% of the women were found in the lower ranks. The second semester of the Academic Year disclosed similar figures. The majority of the women were placed in positions of authority but these positions involved little public exposure.

Insert Table 14 about here

Leadership Performance

The Brigade of Midshipmen were slow to accept women in leadership positions. The women felt they were not taken seriously as they assumed leadership roles. This was due to several factors:

1. Equating leadership with male physical prowess, (by both men and women) and the belief that women could not handle the responsibilities as well as the men

2. Lack of wholehearted support by many of the first class and underclass midshipmen

3. Isolation and role conflicts which were detrimental to the self-confidence of the women in leadership roles.

The acceptance of the women at USNA in leadership positions was viewed from two important perspectives; the male view and the female leader's view. The male subordinates did not take the women seriously and were continually 'testing the water' when the women were in charge. The male peers had a variety of different views ranging from jealousy to toleration ("she got it because she's a woman", "they needed a few women for "token females", and "it was expected"). The male superiors were suspicious that the women could not do the job and they used their charm to climb to the top. The female leaders, on the other hand, thought that their subordinates were not tough to lead, but the junior's "degree of subordination" depended on the upperclass male support. The female leaders felt an uncomfortable unworthiness around their peers, and believed that others must have been equally qualified for their positions. The female leaders were not taken seriously by their seniors until they proved their ability to perform, although the male leaders performance was assumed to be commendable.

Differences in the "mind-set" between the men and women created a negative image of the women as a leader in the Brigade. Women were their own best advertisers in gaining acceptance, but mainly on an individual basis. They frequently heard comments like "You're O.K., but you're an exception, you're not like the others" from the male members of the Brigade. They gained acceptance more rapidly on a one-to-one basis with the men but were still confronted with the traditional male view after four years.

Negative male attitudes were perceived by the women in all four classes to be the major deterrent to their acceptance. The women contended that the negative attitudes were slowly getting better, but still existed, to a large degree, and included such manifestations as:

1. The consideration of "officer" and "woman" to be a conflict in terms.

2. Minor harrassment in the living hall; ridicule during public events, and at the meal tables; and personal deriding at lectures, pep rallies, and whenever a group of women were together.

3. Double standards in sexual mores.

4. Lack of respect from upper classmen, peers, and subordinates.

5. "Baiting" women and staff on the traditions of "color boys", "homecoming queens", etc.

6. Isolation within the company, and from other women.

7. Declaration of the women as "second class citizens" who could not measure up in performance standards.

8. Limitations on non-combatant roles within their own service.

Women also felt that the institution exacerbated problems by treating them with a different set of rules, which they interpreted as unequal treatment. The special standards for women, for example, were: a central focus on them with interviews, the specification that they maintain different open/closed door policies, the requirement that they "double-up" with another woman for "security purposes" during periods of long absences by the Brigade, the mandate that there be at least two women in the gymnasium locker room at the same time, differentiation of challenges on the obstacle course, and placement of their rooms together and close to the women's rest room, which put them on the outer boundaries of their company area. Singly, these events seemed trivial; but together they spelled unequal treatment. Lectures and discussions on sexism and instruction programs for midshipmen regarding the presence of women were frequently publicly ridiculed, although they were, privately, considered informative.

Dating and Fraternization

As the number of women increased in the Brigade, the dating and fraternization, between the male and female midshipmen also increased. Initially, a male "paranoia" existed over fraternization, attributable to staff indoctrination and peer pressure. Both the men and the women found it difficult to separate social and professional relationships. Dating between midshipmen has, to this date, been somewhat accepted, and has become less of an oddity with the passage of time. The fraternization policy has considerable flexibility and a regulating effect only to the relationships between the fourth class midshipmen (plebes or freshmen) and their seniors. Several factors contributed to this change in attitude:

1. Both sexes were less "uptight" about co-existence.

2. Males rationalized that there were women midshipmen dates, and "real" dates (civilian women).

3. Both sexes perceived a lack of institutional pressure.

4. Summer cruises provided an opportunity for improvement of the difficult balance between social and professional relationships.

The informal rules that developed, however, were more restrictive for the women, than men. This informal standards included:

1. Women who dated off-yard and out-of-the-area "with discretion", with a small number of men were more accepted than the socially active female midshipman who flaunted conquests.

2. Dating within the basic military units (squad, platoon) was frowned upon by both sexes.

3. Dating activities in the Living Hall (Bancroft Hall) were looked down upon by both sexes.

Informal peer relationships seemed to be a major factor in retention rates at the Naval Academy. A majority of women interviewed in a recent study (Harrison and Garvin, note 1) indicated that friends--both male and female--were very important, and helped the midshipmen through their first and second years. Women also assigned a high degree of importance to sports and ECA's because of the informal relationships they developed there. The level of acceptance was much higher in informal non-competitive organizations such as these. Women found that they were sometimes rendered ineffective in group projects, because of the Brigade's concern with fraternization. Fraternization, fear of fraternization, and the interpretation of regulations associated with fraternization, however, hampered communication within the midshipman chain of command.

A majority of the women interviewed (Harrison and Garvin, note 1) mentioned the defeminizing influence of the Naval Academy. They felt that their male counterparts did not acknowledge their feminity in most social situations. They complained that the male midshipmen were surprised to see them interested in activities characterized as "feminine", such as sewing, cooking, and needlework. They also complained that the men frequently thought of them as "one of the guys" in group outings, or on dates. The content of their responses suggested that their feelings resulted both from their perceptions of male attitudes and from the confusion and role ambiguity inherent in the development of a non-traditional professional identity. It appeared then, that as the women progressed through the program, their professional development was disrupted by this problem. The women in the Class of 80 mentioned this problem most often within a professional/career context. The classes of 81 and 82 most often in a social context. It is also true, however, that the women in the Class of 1980 were highly competitive and adopted the male standards in professional behavior, possibly because there were only a handful of women officers available to them as role models, and there were no women senior to them in the ranks of midshipmen. Some questions remained as to the utility of the professional model they adopted relative to femininity and to their adjustments as adults. In opting for the male norm in defining their professional identity, it is questionable whether they have created an unresolvable conflict between their professional and personal roles. And more importantly, for professional success, have they adopted a model that they can not "carry off"? These problems, typical in the development of young adults, were accentuated by the military environment at USNA where clear definition of professional roles was of utmost importance.

Living Conditions

Bancroft Hall is the home of the entire Brigade of Midshipmen. The men and women live in integrated company environments. Because of the small number of women at the Academy they have a more limited choice, and less flexibility in terms of roommate assignments. The women with three to a room was decisively the worst combination. Often two of the women would form an alliance against the third, resulting in several cases of attrition. A partial solution to this problem was to make Company and Battalion moves easier for the women, which alleviated the tension between the unhappy females who were forced to room together because of their limited numbers. Thus, if there were no alternative moves within the company unit, a move to a different company, or to another Battalion, could be initiated.

A second problem, particularly with the Class of 80 women, was that their rooms were clustered near the women's heads (lavatories) and were often on the periphery of the Company area. This promoted physical isolation of the women from the centrally located activity found near the company wardrooms. Other policies like those concerning open and closed doors, who was permitted in a woman's room, and under what conditions, proved to be a serious imposition to their privacy and to their social relations in the Hall. Male friends who visited the women for academic, business, or social reasons, felt that they

were being "watched". Because of the open door policy, visits to the women's rooms were less frequent than to a male classmate's room. Most visits to the women's rooms were regarded with suspicion.

Proper diet and weight control also represented a problem for the women. The traditional and substantial diet for the midshipmen (because of strenuous physical activity such as football and crew team practices) contained between 4000 to 4500 calories per day. The high-caloric content of the diet was a serious problem for some of the women, as well as for some of the men. They requested more fruits and foods lower in calories. Women with weight problems had considerable problems in other areas, such as physical performance standards. The initial solution to this problem was to create "Diet Tables" for the women; an existing tradition for the overweight men. The tables were marked with signs which read "Diet Tables", and were highly visible, located near the center of the wardroom. Hence, the "Diet Table" solution proved to be more punitive than constructive in nature. It was dropped in favor of a less visable weight control program, which was run on an individual basis and supervised by the midshipmen's squad leader, company officer, medical officer, and the Physical Education Department.

Summary

The last all male class graduated from the Naval Academy in May of 1979. When the Class of 1983 reported aboard, they were the first plebe class to see women at all levels of leadership. As the Class of 1983, and the classes thereafter move toward their senior year, a new tradition of an integrated U. S. Naval Academy will replace the out-dated tradition of the all male institution. Women have successfully adapted to the rigors of Academy life and have shown equivalent performance on a majority of outcome measures used by the Academy to monitor individual progress. At the same time, there were clear differences in the setting operations tied to these outcomes and to the processes being measured. Ultimately, fleet behavior validates the education and the training received at USNA. Fleet performance by the midshipmen upon graduation will become the measure of the effectiveness of the program.

The Class of 80 women were assimilated and clearly paid a price in attrition for the opportunity to be "the first class with women" at USNA. Subsequent classes have experienced more integration and less assimilation. Change has been more reciprocal. Policy continues to remain a basis for inequity, and will hinder the process of the women "being taken seriously" until all of the inadequacies are ironed out. Number ensures lack of representation in the authority structure which can only be overcome by increasing the number of women midshipmen, or by skillful use of support structures which give voice disproportionate to numbers.

The climate of the institution is a microcosm of the values and the beliefs in our culture The confusion in attitudes towards women in professional roles in our culture is a setting operation that draws men to the program at Annapolis. USNA shapes these attitudes (Durning, 1978) in a positive direction, but the rather confused and conservative starting point is established before they arrive. The process of developing professional women officers is continuous with the visable struggle of women in general to be taken seriously and given equal opportunity to define and implement professional roles. Perhaps the rather dramatic success of the programs at the Academies will influence the general system in a positive manner.

Equivalence is a puny word, but it is the logical way to measure the effects of change (Harrison and Murphy, note 2). As the program at the Naval Academy continues, equivalence will give way to careful scrunity of process and validation of the program in the fleet. "Things take time", thus, the responsibility to ensure the best possible development for both men and women will be a long process. A process that will not only impact on future military organizations but on other institutions in our country as well.

Reference Notes

1. Harrison, P. R. and Garvin, P. C. Women midshipmen's personal perception of the integration process. Presented at the Service Academies Conference on Women, USMA, November 1978.

2. Harrison, P. R. and Murphy, H. B. A systems model of the integration process; a mandated system. Presented at Military Research Sumposium, U. S. Military Academy, June 1979.

References

Bronfenbrenner, U. Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 1977, 32, 7, 513-531.

Durning, K. P. Women at the Naval Academy: The First Year of Integration. (NPRDC TR 78-12). San Diego, California: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, February 1978.

Table 1. Differences in Summer Training for Men and Women[a]

CLASS	TRAINING	DIFFERENCES
4th Class	Plebe Summer at USNA	None
3rd Class	USNA Training Craft Cruise (YP) Cruise on Selected Fleet Units	None
2nd Class	Aviation Flight Training	None
	Marine Corps Introduction	None
	Surface Warfare Operations	Men - Day and Night Ops Women - Day Ops
	Submarine Training	Men - Underway Women - Inport
1st Class	Training aboard selected ships	None
	USNA Leadership programs	Men - In Orlando, San Diego, and The Great Lakes Women - In Orlando

[a]As of 5 August 1980

Table 2. Admission figures for total students and women per class

Class	Total applications	Women applications	Total accepted	Women accepted
1980	12703	759	1295	81
1981	12610	1135	1328	90
1982	12091	1137	1364	96
1983	11771	1223	1404	90

Table 3. Number of men and women on board and percentage attrition for classes at USNA[a]

CLASS	WOMEN ON BOARD	PERCENT ATTRITION	MEN ON BOARD	PERCENT ATTRITION
1980	55	32%	886	27%
1981	61	32%	909	26%
1982	68	29%	1049	17%
1983	72	20%	1166	11%

[a]As of 29 August 1980

Table 4. Comparison of percentage and time of attrition for the men and women at USNA[a]

TIME OF ATTRITION	CLASS							
	1980		1981		1982		1983	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
Plebe Summer	4.7%	7.4%	4.1%	5.6%	4.5%	9.4%	3.7%	6.7%
First Semester	3.9%	8.6%	5.2%	2.2%	1.3%	2.1%	3.0%	1.1%
Second Semester	1.4%	4.9%	0.3%	0.0%	2.6%	2.1%	3.0%	8.9%
Youngster Cruise	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Third Semester	5.8%	3.7%	4.4%	7.8%	2.4%	6.3%	1.2%	3.3%
Fourth Semester	0.7%	0.0%	3.3%	6.7%	2.7%	5.2%	-	-
2/C Summer	1.2%	0.0%	2.3%	3.3%	0.6%	0.0%	-	-
Fifth Semester	6.4%	7.4%	4.4%	4.4%	2.8%	3.1%	-	-
Sixth Semester	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.1%	-	-	-	-
1/C Cruise	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	-	-	-
Seventh Semester	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	-	-	-	-
Eighth Semester	0.7%	0.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Students Remaining	73.6%	67.9%	73.7%	68.9%	82.9%	70.8%	88.9%	80.0%

[a]As of 29 August 1980

Table 5. Number, Percentage, and Reason for Attrition of Men and Women at the U. S. Naval Academy[a]

CLASS	1980		1981		1982		1983	
Men/Women	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
REASON								
Voluntary Summer[b]	81	6	88	9	67	10	50	6
	25.2%	23.1%	27.1%	31.0%	30.9%	35.7%	34.2%	33.3%
Voluntary Ac. Year	127	13	144	19	93	18	52	8
	39.4%	50.0%	44.3%	65.5%	42.9%	64.3%	35.6%	44.4%
Academic	63	3	65	1	47	0	33	4
	19.6%	11.5%	20.0%	3.4%	21.7%	0.0%	22.6%	22.2%
Qualified[c]	22	1	21	0	5	0	2	0
	6.8%	3.8%	6.5%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
Medical	8	2	5	0	3	0	8	0
	2.5%	7.7%	1.5%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%
Aptitude	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
	4.3%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Deceased	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	1.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%
Discharged	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	322	26	325	29	217	28	146	18
	92.5%	7.5%	91.8%	8.2%	88.6%	11.4%	89.0%	11.0%

[a]As of 29 August 1980

[b]Listed in Number followed by Percent

[c]Voluntary resignation requested

Table 6. SAT scores for those still on board and those who have attrited[a]

CLASS	MEN		WOMEN	
	On Board	Attrited	On Board	Attrited
		SAT Verbal		
1980	566.2	559.6	597.4	618.3
1981	569.9	563.8	612.1	600.5
1982	574.6	565.2	610.0	613.4
1983	577.4	565.1	596.3	580.8
		SAT Math		
1980	660.8	655.6	643.3	661.7
1981	664.0	656.1	662.6	661.6
1982	673.4	650.4	654.9	668.6
1983	662.8	655.5	658.2	651.7

[a]As of 29 August 1980

Table 7. Comparison of other selection measures for men and women on board and those attrited in classes of 80, 81, 82, and 83[a]

CLASS	MEN		WOMEN	
	On Board	Attrited	On Board	Attrited
		HIGH SCHOOL CLASS RANK		
1980	576.6	550.2	648.2	640.4
1981	576.4	549.3	653.7	648.3
1982	579.1	556.4	641.2	650.9
1983	575.5	572.5	646.9	680.6
		RECOMMENDATIONS		
1980	806.4	774.4	860.0	819.7
1981	848.8	830.1	852.5	854.9
1982	859.6	860.5	886.4	851.9
1983	880.1	875.0	901.8	924.4
		EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES		
1980	513.5	501.5	474.8	496.7
1981	524.8	515.1	511.4	528.6
1982	527.5	523.1	538.1	536.1
1983	530.3	525.6	530.1	491.4
		STRONG CAMPBELL ENGINEERING SCIENCE SCALE		
1980	543.7	526.6	527.2	524.1
1981	525.4	515.3	517.0	517.0
1982	528.8	515.8	531.7	519.8
1983	529.5	514.2	534.1	498.6
		STRONG CAMPBELL DISENROLLMENT SCALE		
1980	540.8	520.1	532.9	552.6
1981	539.0	518.9	542.3	506.5
1982	538.3	531.6	521.9	527.2
1983	532.8	513.8	531.9	512.4

Table 8. Comparison of cummulative academic grade point ratios (QPR) and military grade point ratios (MQPR) for men and women in classes of 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983[a]

	ACADEMIC QPR							
CLASS	1980		1981		1982		1983	
Semester	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
2	2.64	2.35	2.68	2.66	2.69	2.70	2.65	2.57
4	2.74	2.57	2.75	2.73	2.76	2.76		
6	2.76	2.69	2.78	2.81				
8	2.79	2.74						

	MILITARY QPR							
CLASS	1980		1981		1982		1983	
Semester	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
2	2.97	2.86	3.03	2.99	3.01	3.07	2.97	2.86
4	2.99	2.88	3.02	3.04	3.00	3.04		
6	3.04	3.01	3.04	3.06				
8	3.00	2.93						

[a]As of 29 August 1980

Table 9. Percentage of men and women in different major areas by class[a]

Group[b]	Engineering	Science	Humanities/ Social Science[c]
1980			
Men	39.6%	42.2%	18.6%
Women	7.3%	63.6%	29.1%
1981			
Men	35.7%	48.7%	17.0%
Women	18.0%	37.7%	44.3%
1982			
Men	44.6%	41.9%	17.4%
Women	27.9%	42.6%	33.8%
1983			
Men	47.3%	35.9%	18.3%
Women	19.4%	48.6%	36.1%

[a]As of 29 August 1980

[b]There are eight Engineering, six Science, and four Humanities/Social Science majors

[c]Only 20% of the Brigade are permitted in Humanities/Social Science majors

Table 10. Physical fitness test standards for men and women

Mile Run

Men - 5:15 (100%) ; 6:30 (passing)
Women - 6:15 (100%) ; 7:30 (passing)

Applied-Strength (Muscular Strength)

Men

Pull-ups

	Minimum	Maximum
4/C	3	15
3/C	4	16
2/C	5	17
1/C	6	18

Standing long jump:

	Minimum	Maximum
4/C	72 inches	105 inches
3/C	73 inches	106 inches
2/C	74 inches	107 inches
1/C	75 inches	108 inches

Sit-ups (2 minutes):

	Minimum	Maximum
4/C	58	79
3/C	59	80
2/C	60	81
1/C	61	82

Women

Flexed-arm-hang

	Minimum	Maximum
4/C	13 sec	43 sec
3/C	15 sec	45 sec
2/C	18 sec	48 sec
1/C	20 sec	50 sec

Standing long jump:

	Minimum	Maximum
4/C	60 inches	84 inches
3/C	61 inches	85 inches
2/C	62 inches	86 inches
1/C	63 inches	87 inches

Sit-ups (2 minutes):

	Minimum	Maximum
4/C	53	74
3/C	54	75
2/C	55	76
1/C	56	77

Obstacle Course (Pass/Fail)

440 yards and 13 obstacles

Men	Women
2:55	3:40

Table 11. Percentage comparisons of the performance of men and women in the Classes of 80, 81, 82, and 83, or overall Physical Education grades, the mile run, and the applied strength test[a]

	Class of 1980				Class of 1981				Class of 1982				Class of 1983			
Semester[c]	First		Second		First		Second		First		Second		First		Second	
MEN/WOMEN	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
OVERALL																
Pass	87	86	98	93	85	75	93	87	87	84	91	79	88	84	88	71
Fail	2	5	0	4	3	13	--	8	6	11	--	7	3	6	5	16
Incomplete[b]	11	10	2	4	12	12	6	5	7	5	9	14	10	10	7	13
MILE RUN																
Pass	92	87	99	95	97	87	97	94	99	96	97	87	99	93	98	84
Fail	1	5	--	4	--	7	--	3	--	1	--	4	--	1	--	1
Incomplete	7	7	1	2	2	5	3	3	1	3	3	9	1	6	2	15
APPLIED STRENGTH																
Pass	94	89	99	98	96	95	99	95	99	96	99	93	97	96	97	84
Fail	1	--	--	--	1	2	--	5	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	4
Incomplete	5	11	1	2	3	3	2	--	1	4	2	7	2	4	2	12

[a]Grade percentages evaluated on different scales for men and women

[b]Incomplete signifies medically unqualified to take the test when administered

[c]Data for first semester as of December 1979
Data for second semester as of May 1980

Table 12. Conduct summary of Naval Academy women[a]

Demerits awarded to women compared to class

	Total awarded	Total to women	Percentage of total
1980	15,434	790	5.1%
1981	19,265	685	3.6%
1982	21,584	785	3.6%
1983	32,514	1491	4.6%

Average dermerits per capita midshipmen and number of major offenses

	Average per Midn	Average per Woman	Major Offenses	
			M	W
1980	16.03	14.36	110	8
1981	19.66	11.42	87	2
1982	19.55	12.27	105	3
1983	26.26	21.00	39	3

Conduct grades for men vs women

		Grade									
		A		B		C		D		F	
	SEMESTER	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
1980	1	86%	91%	7%	4%	1%	2%	2%	0%	4%	4%
	2	79%	85%	10%	4%	3%	4%	3%	0%	4%	7%
1981	1	78%	89%	10%	5%	4%	3%	3%	2%	4%	2%
	2	81%	92%	11%	5%	2%	2%	2%	0%	4%	2%
1982	1	83%	84%	11%	11%	2%	3%	2%	0%	2%	3%
	2	78%	86%	13%	7%	4%	4%	2%	0%	4%	3%
1983	1	81%	87%	12%	8%	4%	4%	3%	1%	1%	0%
	2	80%	87%	12%	8%	4%	4%	3%	0%	1%	1%
Average		80.8%	87.6%	9.4%	6.5%	3.0%	3.3%	3.0%	1.4%	3.0%	2.8%

[a]As of May 1980 for first and second semester

Table 13. Distribution of Women Midshipmen in positions of authority[a]

	NUMBER IN DIFFERENT LEVELS OF ORGANIZATION						
LEVEL	CAPT	CDR	LCDR	LT	LTjg	ENS	MPO
BRIGADE							
First[b]	0	0	0	2	0	--	--
Second	0	0	0	0	0	--	--
REGIMENTAL							
First	--	0	0	0	1	0	0
Second	--	0	0	3	1	0	0
BATTALION							
First	--	--	1	0	0	--	--
Second	--	--	1	1	3	--	--
COMPANY							
First	--	--	--	0	5	41	2
Second	--	--	--	2	10	23	0
	CAPT	CDR	LCDR	LT	LTjg	ENS	MPO
Total positions available for entire class	1	4	11	68	169	111	21

[a]For the women in the Class of 1980

[b]For the first and second semesters of Academic Year 1979-80

Table 14. Comparison of men and women in positions of authority[a]

	PERCENTAGE IN STRIPER POSITIONS						
	CAPT	CDR	LCDR	LT	LTjg	ENS	MPO
FIRST SEMESTER							
Men	100	100	91.0	97.0	96.4	63.1	90.5
Women	0	0	9.0	2.9	3.6	36.9	9.5
SECOND SEMESTER							
Men	100	100	100	91.0	91.7	79.3	100
Women	0	0	9.0	8.8	8.3	20.7	0

	TOTAL IN POSITIONS OF AUTHORITY			
	Number of stripers[b]	Number men/ women per class	Percent of men/women stripers	Percent of LTjg and below
FIRST SEMESTER				
Men	333	907	36.7%	75.7%
Women	52	55	94.5%	94.2%
SECOND SEMESTER				
Men	341	894	38.1%	71.3%
Women	44	55	80.0%	84.1%

[a]For the Class of 1980

[b]Out of 385 possible positions